

From: Ron Voss <Rvoss@lightspeed.ca>
Subject: Second Reading Bylaw 24/2024
Date: December 11, 2024 at 7:42:00 PM MST
To: CouncilDist <CouncilDist@cochrane.ca>

Dear Council,

Pleased to see on second reading of Bylaw 24/2024, the town's new municipal development plan (MDP), that my concerns raised at the public hearing about the reference to "climate change" and "infills" in the MDP were not perceived as the ravings of a lone individual in our town to be ignored, as suggested by the CAO.

Councillor Nagel, despite your attempted stand for the residents of Cochrane re your concerns about the references to "infill" in the MDP, your suggested change to the wording from "infill" to "redevelopment" essentially changed nothing, as the consultant Ms. Dillon had basically told you that these terms are used interchangeably, when she told you, "Infill or redevelopment as being an opportunity to increase density". Or as Councillor Reed explained, nothing more than a "much more palatable" term or as Councillor McFadden explained, redevelopment and infill are "primarily...the same thing". So, you were played. Noteworthy that the mayor before being prepared to vote on your motion first asked Mr. Krysinski and the consultant if they were satisfied with such a change, and not surprisingly they happily agreed to it, thereby determining how the mayor would choose to vote, meeting the interests of the Administration.

The mayor bringing them into the debate on a motion, in my view, was a procedural irregularity among many irregularities associated with Councillor Nagel's motion. That should have been ruled out of order as amendments should be relevant and not be a radical departure from the original motion, that is, they should be germane. As explained by Robert's Rules, "Any amendment proposed must in some ways involve the same question raised by the motion it amends. This is known as the requirement that an amendment must be germane." That's not the only irregularity allowed by the mayor. In the debate that followed Councillor Nagel's motion, the mayor also offered his opinion about climate change, thereby not following rules of order in that debate must be germane to the pending motion. Most importantly, changing the wording from "infill" to "redevelopment" was an amendment to Bylaw 24/204 and should have been voted on alone as an amendment; not at the same time as thereby approving the bylaw. After, that amendment, if there were no other amendments, the motion would be to approve the Bylaw 24/2024 including the amendment. By doing so, Councillor Wilson, for example, was stopped from bringing an amendment forward regarding "climate change". After seven years, this award-winning mayor is still inept at officiating a meeting.

However, Councillor Wilson if you had succeeded in expunging the words "climate change" from the MDP, there was other language remaining in the MDP, which I had

referenced in my public hearing presentation, which were related to the matter of mitigating climate change. For example, on page 101, it was stated that the objective with respect to mobility was to "support sustainable and low-carbon travel options and emerging transportation technologies". Similarly, on page 104, there was a call out to "advance low-carbon mobility options". More scooters? Conduct a study to electrify the COLT buses. The MDP was even more specific on page 41, where it specified "reducing greenhouse gas emissions", precisely the language found in section 3.3.3 on page 67 of the CMRB Growth Plan. As explained by the consultant, Ms. Dillon, the inclusion of "climate change resiliency, adaptation, mitigation policies" within the MDP is required "to align with the regional growth plan". Nonetheless, given that Councillors McFadden and Flowers as well as Mayor Genung were strongly opposed to removal of the reference to "climate change" and their policies in the MDP, your motion to remove it would have failed anyways. However, it would be of interest to know how Councillors Nagel and Reed would have voted on such a motion. So, Councillors Nagel and Reed would you have voted to remove the reference to "climate change" in the MDP?

Sincerely,

Ron Voss

P.S. It has been reported that at its Regular Council meeting on December 10th, Rocky View County voted to withdraw from the CMRB. I would suggest that before the Town forwards its MDP on to the CMRB for review and approval that it sort this out first.

With respect to the issues, namely, climate change and infills, that were drawing attention at the meeting, Councillor McFadden you expressed the view, "I think by and large the fact that the feedback on those is coming from a very um.....well let's rephrase it the other way I think broadly there's a lot of support for the document as it is." I note that you stopped yourself short from completing the first part of your sentence which was clearly directed at me. I invite you to complete that sentence, "the fact that the feedback on those is coming from a very" what?